

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/799,174 First Named Applicant: Diana Lane
Examiner: Donnie Crosland Art Unit: 2612 Status of Application: pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Fred Lane (2) Donnie Crosland
(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 6 Feb 08 Proposed Time: 10 AM/PM
office time

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>27,34,38,41,42,44</u>	<u>Rothschild</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>22,35</u>	<u>Rothschild</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>29,34,41,42</u>	<u>Basile</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>database</u>	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

see continuation sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

58188

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form Continuation Sheet

Application No. 10/799,174

First Named Applicant: Diana Lane

Examiner: Donnie Crosland

Art Unit 2612

Status: Pending

Date and Time: 6 Feb. 2008

Issues Discussed

- (1) Rejection of claims 27, 34, 38, 41, 42, 44 for **encryption and decryption** as suggested in col. 3 lines 49-52 and col. 5 lines 1-10 of Basile and passwords of par. 0010 and 0018 of Rothschild. Applicant asserted that passwords and encryption of data are very different operations. Passwords restrict access to memory addresses, which still allow data to be read once accessed. Encryption/decryption scrambles data according to a seed algorithm, which cannot be read even if accessed. Examiner agreed. Applicant cited Rothschild only citing passwords, and Basile suggested encryption and decryption to be used in secure transmission of data across public lines, which is well known in the art. Neither Rothschild nor Basile, suggest encryption of portions of the data, nor motivation to encrypt portions of the data as delineated in these claims as constituted or amended during the interview. Motivation for encryption scheme of the present claims are supported by, among others, para. 0018, 0070, and Fig. 2, 3, 4 of Lane. Language was proposed for the claims and agreed by Examiner.
- (2) Rejection of claims 22, 35, and those dependent there-from were discussed in regard to providing a limitation of a **purging step** used in enrolling prior to subsequent enrollment. The purging step as claimed, is quite different from a mere overwriting of data as suggested by Examiner. The analogy was used that what if, while reading a string of emails, the contents of each email were purged (gotten rid of) from the email apparatus before the next email could be read. Motivation for purging data was supported by, among others, para. 0010, 0017, 0058, 0072, and element 140 of Lane. Examiner agreed that purge step was novel and unobvious over the prior art. Language was taken from dependent claim 26, which was cancelled, and added into corresponding claims to cite this limitation. Language was proposed at the interview and agreed.
- (3) Rejection of claims 29, 34, 41, 42 were discussed for providing a **decryption key** to a third party authority as disclosed in Fig. 3, and 4 of Lane. The importance of the decryption key being held separate from either the enroller or the recipient of the kit was discussed. The idea being that without reliance upon a centralized database, and having encrypted portions of the data contained only on the kit, there would be little motivation for an ill disposed party to hack into personal information of the subject. There are times when it would be appropriate to combine the information from the kit into a centralized database, such as that of the NCIC. In order to safeguard the privacy of the individual, encrypted portions of the data are only able to be decrypted when such data is released by the parent or guardian to the third party authority who has not held the data, but currently holds the decryption key. Examiner agreed that, with this explanation, claims

34 and 42 could be allowed as previously amended. Other claims as mentioned are also in line with the schema.

- (4) General discussion was across the claims as held regarding the centralized database. The case was made for having a schema in which there was no centralized database to hack into. Examiner generally agreed to the concept, but objected to the language such as "not found in" as being a negative limitation. Applicant has worked to amended out the negative limitation with language such as "found only in the kit". This reads over the prior art as the references both relied upon a centralized database or a relational database to at least back up the contents of the kit. Examiner has agreed to read the amended claims in this light, and may propose further language if the current language is not suitable.

The above is my recollection of the examiner's interview, with any errors in recording or recollection being unintentional, and given with the hope that this record will hasten the examination to allowance and issue.

Respectfully,

/Fred Lane/

Fred Lane

Reg. # 58,188